DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 858 FL 008 260

AUTHOR Kachru, Braj B.
TITLE Toward Structuring Code-Mixing: An Indian Perspective.
PUB DATE [76]
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Dravidian Languages; *English; *Hindi; Indo European Languages; Language Development; Language Patterns; Language Research; *Language Role; Language Usage; *Language Variation; Linguistic Borrowing; *Multilingualism; Persian; Sentence Structure; Sociocultural Patterns; Sociolinguistics; Syntax
IDENTIFIERS Code Mixing (Languages); *India; South Asian Languages

ABSTRACT

The notion of language dependency presupposes that there is a hierarchy of languages in a multilingual society, and that each language is assigned a functional role in a multilingual individual's restricted or extended spheres of linguistic interaction. In South Asia, language dependency has resulted in linguistic convergence of two types: (1) convergence within the inner language circle, that is, within South Asian languages; (2) outer linguistic imposition, or dependency on languages outside the South Asian language periphery. This type of convergence is seen in the Persianization and the Anglicization of the inner circle languages. This study is concerned with an aspect of the convergence with English, code-mixing, or the use of one or more languages for consistent transfer of linguistic units from one language into another, resulting in a new code of linguistic interaction. Code-mixing is role-dependent because the religious, social, economic, and regional characteristics of the participants are crucial in understanding the event. It is function-dependent because the specialized use to which a language is being put determines code-mixing. The study explores the formal manisfestations and motivations for code-mixing, the acceptability constraints on it, and its influence on South Asian languages. (CLK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED132858

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TOWARD STRUCTURING CODE-MIXING: AN INDIAN PERSPECTIVE

Braj B. Kachru

0. INTRODUCTION.[1] The formal and pragmatic aspects of language dependency in linguistically pluralistic societies[2] have yet to be seriously studied by linguists. The term 'language dependency' presupposes that there is a hierarchy of languages and that each language is assigned a functional role (or roles) in a multilingual person's restricted or extended spheres of linguistic interaction.

In South Asia, language dependency has resulted in linguistic convergence of primarily two types. The first type may be termed convergence with the 'inner' language circle -- that is, within the South Asian languages. The second type may be termed the 'outer' linguistic imposition. That means dependency on those languages which are outside the South Asian language periphery. Convergence within the 'inner' language circle has resulted mainly in two processes, viz., the Aryanization of the Dravidian languages (e.g. Sridhar 1975) and the Dravidization of the Indo-Aryan languages (e.g. Gumperz and Wilson 1971). The extent and scope of such Aryanization and Dravidization has already been discussed in the literature at various linguistic levels (see, for example, Emeneau and Burrow 1962, Gumperz and Wilson 1971, and Sridhar 1975).

Convergence from the 'outer' circle involves several non-South Asian languages; however, the chief manifestation of this type of convergence is seen in the Persianization and also in the Englishization (Anglicization) of the languages of the 'inner' circle (B. Kachru 1975b). An aspect of convergence with one language, English, of the 'outer' circle forms the basis of this study.

FL008260

1.0 TWO ASPECTS OF LANGUAGE DEPENDENCY: "CODE-SWITCHING" AND "CODE-MIXING". In a speech community, language dependency is shown in two ways, among others. First, a multilingual assigns areas of function to each language which he uses to perform various roles. One might say that, by and large, the contextual units (B. Kachru 1965) in which each language functions are mutually exclusive, or dependent on the participants in a linguistically relevant situation. Secondly, language dependency might result in developing new, mixed codes of communication.[3]

A good example of the first type of dependency results in what is termed 'code-switching' (Gumperz 1964). In the literature this term has been used to denote the functional contexts in which a multilingual person makes alternate use of two or more languages. However, I am not concerned with that particular phenomenon of language dependency here.

The linguistic situation which I shall present here may be seen as an outcome of both language contact and code-switching. In other words, I am concerned with the formal manifestation of the functional uses of several languages by a multilingual person. I shall use the term 'code-mixing' for this aspect of multilingualism (B. Kachru 1975a and 1975b).

The term 'code-mixing' refers to the use of one or more languages for consistent transfer of linguistic units from one language into another, and by such a language mixture developing a new restricted -- or not so restricted -- code of linguistic interaction. Such 'mixed' codes have developed in several language areas in South Asia. One such very common code has been termed 'Hinglish'. Some Persianized varieties of South Asian languages may also be considered mixed codes in the same sense (B. Kachru 1975b). The transfer of units of one language into another language is conditioned by several linguistic, pragmatic and attitudinal considerations. I shall return to this point later.

The implications of code-mixing are sociolinguistically very important. In addition, this linguistic phenomenon also has implications for language dynamics and language change (see section 6.0).

2.0. TOWARD STRUCTURING CODE-MIXING. In the current literature, the discussion of code-mixing in South Asian languages is generally restricted to presenting various attitudinal positions on using the device of code-mixing in these languages (e.g., Raghuvira 1973). There are thus the arguments of the 'purists' and the 'non-purists' in favor of their respective positions concerning Suddh Hindi (High Hindi), Hindustani, or Englishized or Persianized Hindi. The phenomenon of code-mixing has

yet to be viewed in a theoretical framework which would relate the formal and functional aspects of such 'language-mixing' and view it in a pragmatic perspective in terms of the linguistic needs of the speech community which uses this language device for various types of interaction within the speech community and also outside it.

In Firth (1957a and 1957b; see also fn. 3), and later in somewhat modified form in Mitchell (1957), Halliday (1958), Ellis (1966) and Kachru (1966) a schema has been presented toward delimiting texts with reference to their contextually relevant categories and formal categories. Firth has suggested the following categories for the context of situation of a text.

A. The relevant features of participants: persons, personalities.
   (i) Verbal actions of participants.
   (ii) Non-verbal actions of participants.
B. The relevant objects.
C. The effect of the verbal action.

Other features to be considered are:

A. Economic, religious, social structures to which participants belong.
B. Types of discourse: monologue, narrative.
C. Personal interchange: age of participants.
D. Types of speech -- social flattery, cursing, etc.

Let us now examine how this schema can be applied to the situation of code-mixing in South Asia. Code-mixing is a role-dependent and function-dependent linguistic phenomenon. In terms of role, one has to ask who is using the language, and in terms of function, one has to ask what is to be accomplished by the speech act. In terms of role, then, the religious, social, economic and regional characteristics of the participant in a speech act are crucial. On the other hand, in terms of function, the specialized uses to which the given language is being put determines the code-mixing. In a sense, then, in several linguistically relevant situations there is a mutual expectancy

between the formal characteristics of the language (in this case, a code-mixed language) and its function.

2.1 Code-mixing and the context of situation: I shall attempt to discuss the phenomenon of code-mixing in the theoretical framework of the 'context of situation' originally presented by Malinowski (1935) and modified in linguistic terms by Firth (1957a and 1957b). I feel encouraged to do so now since what were considered the linguistic 'sins' of Firth only a decade ago (see Langendoen 1968, especially sections 2 and 3) seem to have become the cardinal points of our current linguistic paradigm. Consider, for example, the current preoccupation with 'pragmatics'. It may, therefore, be in order to take another look at the Firthian concept of the context of situation with special reference to the phenomenon of code-mixing.

The concept, context of situation, provides a framework for relating language use and linguistic form to the 'immediate' linguistically relevant situation and also to the 'wider' context of culture. Elucidating the concept, Firth writes (1957b:175-76),[3]

> The context of situation ... is not merely a setting, background or 'backdrop' for the 'words'. The text in the focus of attention on renewal of connection with an instance is regarded as an integral part of the context, and is observed in relation to the other parts regarded as relevant in the statement of the context.

It seems to me that in order to provide linguistically and contextually adequate explanations for code-mixed language-types it would be appropriate to relate such language-types to what I have earlier termed 'contextual units' (B. Kachru 1965).

By a contextual unit, we mean those features of a text which contribute to its being assigned to a particular function. These features

may be termed the contextual parameters of a text. These would comprise linguistically relevant clues, such as the participants, their sex, their position on the social, caste, or religious hierarchy. In abstracting these categories we must concentrate only on those clues which are linguistically justifiable. We might then view a speech act in terms of clear end-points which have, on the one hand, a time-dimension, and on the other hand, relevance with reference to the role-relationships obtaining among the participants engaged in the speech act. Let me give two illustrations to make this point clearer:

> The speech function of greetings or blessings have well-defined beginnings and ends. In addition, greetings and blessings also provide clues about the people involved in the exchange of such speech functions. One might claim that, to a large extent, such speech functions are both language-bound and culture-bound. On the other hand, the concept of register, to a large extent, is language-free and culture-free, and the participants are primarily bound together by language use -- for example, those who use the register of law or aviation engineering. Note that code-mixing seems to identify not only the use of the language but also the user, since it involves both an attitudinal reaction toward a language-mixer and also the registral use of language.
>
> The appropriateness of a code-mixed language type to a specific situation may be judged by *contextual-substitution* and *textual substitution*.
>
> In certain contextual units, a multilingual person has the possibility of a choice between code-mixed (say Hindi and English or Persian) or non-code-mixed languages. In such situations, the selection of a particular 'code' is determined by the attitude of a person toward a language (or toward a certain type of code-mixing), or the prestige which a language (or a type of code-mixing) has in a speech community.

2.2 Code-mixing and formal cohesion: There are several questions which one might ask concerning the formal characteristics of code-mixing. The first question is: What is the distinction between 'borrowing' and code-mixing? The second question is: What are the criteria for considering code-mixing functionally crucial for a speech community? In other words, how does one judge the functional and formal appropriateness of code-mixing as an additional communicative device in various speech communities?

Code-mixed language types can easily be considered as examples of extended borrowing not restricted to the lexical level of a language. Borrowing is the initial step toward code-mixing. It is, however, not the only criterion. In the case of several South Asian languages, borrowing from Dutch, Portuguese, and French, for example, has not resulted in any serious code-mixing. On the other hand, borrowing from English and Persian has resulted in cultivation of special language types (see Bahri 1960 and B. Kachru 1975b).

Formal appropriateness in code-mixing may be judged by using the concept of formal cohesion. The formal cohesive characteristics -- lexical or grammatical -- may be abstracted from code-mixed discourse types, register types or speech functions (B. Kachru 1966:268-69). There is, therefore, a linguistic expectancy and dependency between the formal characteristics and the functional characteristics of such (code-mixed) language types. In other words, a particular type of lexical and grammatical cohesion is associated with a specific type of discourse or register as a speech-function.

3.0. FORMAL MANIFESTATIONS OF CODE-MIXING. In linguistic terms code-mixing involves functioning, at least, in a disystem, and as a consequence, developing another linguistic code comprising formal features of two or more codes. A linguistic code developed in this manner then develops a formal cohesion and functional expectancy. In such a situation one language functions as an absorbing language since the 'mixed' items are generally assimilated into its system. One might then say that the function of code-mixed languages is between what is termed 'diglossia' (Ferguson 1959) and code-switching. In a diglossia situation there is a situationally-determined use of two codes, and the codes involved are functionally mutually exclusive. Explaining this phenomenon, Ferguson says that in such a situation,

> . . . two varieties of language exist side by side throughout the community, with each having a definite role to play. (1959:429).

In code-switching, on the other hand, the functional domains of the languages involved are determined by linguistically pluralistic situations, say, for example, the Punjabi-Hindi code-switching in Hariana or in the Punjab; or the Telugu-Dakhini code-switching in Hyderabad.

In a given multilingual situation, it is difficult to say that a person will code-mix in only one or two acquired languages. The tendency is to code-mix in all the languages in which a person code-switches with proficiency. Consider, for example, the case of Punjabi and Hindi code-switching. In these languages, code-mixing is not restricted to these two only, but involves English and Persian as well.

3.1 Process of mixing: I shall discuss below the various linguistic units and processes which are involved in code-mixing. The illustrations of code-mixing provided below are primarily from Hindi and English.

(a) Unit Insertion: This refers to the introduction of a grammatical unit above a word (e.g. a noun phrase or a verb phrase) in a sentence from another language.

NP Insertion

1. ṭenk va reḍār prāpt karne kī bhī yojnā (NBT, 8.3.75)
   tank and radar procure doing of also scheme
   'a scheme for procuring tanks and radar, too'
2. prezidant haus mẽ, protokol hai, magar vājib sā (D, 26.3.72)
   president house in protocol is but desirable like
   'The president's house has protocol, but it is desirable.'

VP Insertion

3. vipaksh dvārā vāk āuṭ (NBT, 7.3.75)
   opposition by walk out
   'opposition walks out'

(b) Unit Hybridization: This refers to the use of code-mixing within a unit (e.g. a noun phrase, a verb phrase, or a compound verb). Consider, for example:

4. isliye cāns lene ke sivā hamāre pās koī upāy nahĩ thā (D, 17.6.73)
   therefore chance taking of except our near any alternative not was
   'There was no alternative before us except taking a chance.'
5. sarkas aur numāyiś yahā̃ phel hā̃ī (D, 17.6.73)
   circus and exhibition here fail are
   'Circuses and exhibitions do not succeed here.'
6. tīsre din kuch zarūrī ḍrāpht ṭāyp karvāne the (SH, 13.6.71)
   third day some important draft type do (caus.) were

'On the third day some important drafts had to be typed.'

The process of unit hybridization has developed into an extremely productive process for 'mixing' Indian languages such as Hindi-Urdu with the non-Indian languages, English and Persian. In Kashmiri an identical process is applied to code-mixing with English and Persian. The following examples are illustrative: ṭebəl kursī 'table and chair', zilā kəmīṭī 'district committee', səkūl bhavan 'school building', halkē prezidənṭ 'a president of the "halqua" (used in the sense of area)'. This process is not medium-restricted and is common in both spoken and written languages. Let us consider some such hybridized items from Hindi-Urdu here. This process is most productive in producing what are termed 'compound verbs' and 'conjunct verbs' in Hindi-Urdu (Y. Kachru 1966). Examples of the first type are expect karnā 'to expect', bore karnā 'to bore', satisfy karnā 'to satisfy'. Examples of the second type are holiday lenā 'to take a holiday', permission denā 'to grant permission', leave denā 'to grant a leave'.

(c) Sentence Insertion: This refers to the process of inserting a sentence of a language different from that of the discourse. It may be either an embedded, conjoined or appositional sentence. The following examples included sentences of English inserted into Hindi discourse.

7. purānī hai to kyā huā, phāin to hai, but I do not like Rajesh Khanna (D, 27.4.73)
   old is so what happened fine however is ...
   'Even if it is old, it is fine; but I do not like Rajesh Khanna'.

8. parhne mẽ sīmā kī bahut rucī hai, vah kahtī hai education is
   studying in Sima of much interest is she says ...
   necessary for life (D, 29.4.73)
   'Sima is very much interested in studies. She says, "Education

is necessary for life."'

9. yah ek nāzuk māmlā hai, let's not talk on [sic] it (D., 17.6.73)
this one delicate matter is ...
'It is a delicate matter; let's not talk about it.'

(d) Idiom and Collocation Insertion: The idioms and collocations of English have generally a higher frequency of occurrence in code-mixed Indian languages than, say, proverbs. The proverbs of Persian are, however, inserted in certain styles of Kashmiri (both spoken and written) and Hindustani. Consider, for example, the following idioms.

10. aur māī parivartan ghar se šurū karūgā kyūki charity begins at home (D, 29.4.73)
and I changes home from begin will do because ...
'And I will initiate change from my home because charity begins at home.'

11. ... apnī bāt kā samarthan youth is blunder kah kar kartī hai (D, 29.4.73)
own story of support ... having said does Aux
'She supports her story by saying that youth is blunder.'

12. suniye, āp kām kariye sab ṭhīk hogā after all Rome was
listen (hon.) you work do everything fine will be ...
not built in a day
'Listen, if you work, everything will be all right; after all, Rome was not built in a day.'

13. māī kah rahā hū ki one in hand is two in the bush
I say -ing am that ...
'I am saying that one in the hand is worth two in the bush.'

14. tum ko ho kyā ga yā why do you cry over spilt milk sab ṭhīk ho jāyega.
you to happen what or ... everything fine be will go

'No matter what happens, why cry over spilt milk? Everything

will be all right.'

15. āj kal kongres dog in the manger policy adopt kar rahā hai,
nowadays congress ... do -ing is
yah ṭhīk nahī̃

this right not

Nowadays congress is adopting a dog in the manger policy;
this isn't good.'

(e) Inflection attachment and reduplication: A number of English and Persian borrowings in South Asian languages have undergone the inflectional processes of the South Asian language in such code-mixing, e.g. sakūlī ḍigrī vālā 'a person who possesses a school degree' (D, 12.8.73). A discussion on such inflection is presented in Bhatia (1967) and B. Kachru (1975a and 1975b) for English borrowings, and in Bahri (1960) for Persian borrowings.

The process of reduplication, which is very common in South Asian language, is applied to English items to convey the semantic function of indefinitization, e.g.

16. ... us par savār ek čālak kaksh mẽ gayā aur pūchā,
that on riding one driver room in went and asked
peṭrol-veṭrol bhar liyā hai (D, 17.6.73)
petrol and the like filled has
'A rider went inside the room and asked if petrol (gas) and the like had been filled.'

17. ... akṭing-vakṭing mãī kyā jānū re (SH, 29.7.73)
acting and the like I what should know hey
'How do I know acting and the like?'

3.2 Lexicalization: I shall use the term 'lexicalization' to refer to lexical infusion in a language from a lexical source (or sources) not native to that particular language, for example, English and Persian lexical strata in Hindi or Kashmiri.

In South Asia this infusion has worked in several directions, e.g. the Indianization of English (B. Kachru 1965 and 1966), and the Persianization and Englishization of the Dravidian and Indo-Aryan languages (Bahri 1960, Sridhar 1975).

I shall mainly concentrate here on the type of lexicalization which has resulted in introducing additional lexical strata in a language. In several South Asian languages there are such co-existing lexical strata whose use is to a large extent functionally determined. The role of these co-existing (but functionally distinct) lexical strata can be better explained in the framework of the contextual units related to the overall context of situation. The choice of a particular lexical stratum, out of the total range, is conditioned by appropriateness of several types, e.g. the participants' sex, religion, caste, and occupation.

The following examples from Sanskritized, Persianized, and Englishized verb formations with the structure V + operator (Y. Kachru 1968) are illustrative.

Sanskritized	Persianized	Englishized	
ārambh karnā	šurū karnā	begin karnā	'to begin'
adhikār karnā	kabzā karnā	control karna	'to control'
bhūl karnā	galatī karnā	mistake karnā	'to make a mistake'
cintā karnā	phikir karnā	worry karnā	'to worry'
dayā karnā	raham karnā	pity karnā	'to pity'
ghriṇā karnā	naphrat karnā	hate karnā	'to hate'

4.0 MOTIVATIONS FOR CODE-MIXING. The motivations for code-mixing are primarily of two types, i.e. attitudinal and linguistic. However, to a certain extent, these two tend to overlap. The attitudinal and pragmatic reasons for code-mixing are more or less identical to the reasons which encourage code-switching. The question I am asking here is: What are the linguistic motivations for code-mixing? It seems to me that basically there are three motivations: role identification, register identification, and desire for elucidation and interpretation.

The parameters for role identification are social, registral, and educational. The languages which a multilingual person 'mixes' contribute to placing him in the hierarchy of the social network in which he functions; it also marks his attitude and relationship toward the participants in a speech act and, consequently, the attitudes of the other participants toward him.

I shall attempt to illustrate this point with reference to three types of code-mixing current in India and the attitudinal consequences of each of these. First, we look at the code-mixing of a South Asian language with English. In attitudinal terms this is a mark of modernization, high socio-economic position, and identity with a certain type of elite group; and in stylistic terms it marks what may be termed 'deliberate' style. It is used as a marker of 'modernization' or to mark the registral features of special language types. Secondly, we examine the features of the code-mixing of a South Asian language with Persian. This identifies a person in terms of his religion and/or occupation. However, on the cline of modernization this type of code-mixing is lower than code-mixing with English. Stylistically, the more Perso-Arabic influence one shows, the more exclusive the style becomes in terms of the participant

and role. The Perso-Arabic style is, however, widely used in the legal register. Third, we look at the code-mixing of South Asian languages with Sanskrit. This again is a religion and caste-marking feature; and, to some extent, it is also a marker of exclusiveness. In stylistic terms it is identified as panditāu (or 'pedantic') style.

A large number of South Asian languages have developed these three linguistic role-identifying code-mixed styles of language. Consider, for example, Bengali (Dil 1972), Hindi (Bahri 1960, Bhatia 1967, B. Kachru 1975b), Kannada (Sridhar 1975), and Kashmiri (B. Kachru 1973).

It seems to me that it might be more insightful to characterize several Indian languages and dialects on the basis of the type of code-mixing involved in each caste and religious dialect, rather than simply on the basis of caste and religion per se. However, in certain speech communities a neat dichotomy and categorization is not possible, e.g. as in Kashmiri.

The use of the terms 'register-identification' and 'registral characteris ics' with reference to code-mixing needs further explanation. It can be demonstrated that one formal clue for the identification of various 'register-types' is the type of code-mixing involved. For example, in the case of Hindi, code-mixing with English is an essential distinguishing feature of technological, scientific, and some restricted newspaper registers, e.g. sports reporting. The following are illustrative.

20. Amresh apnī kuch medikal kī kitābē, drag kampaniyō ke
Amresh own some medical of books drug company+pl. of
keṭalag ke pulinde, stetheskop sambhāle ... (S, 4.72)
catalogue of bundles stethescope holding

'Amresh, with some medical books, with bundles of catalogues of drug companies, and holding a stethescope, .

21. āiye, glāiḍing karẽ, dillī ke glāiḍing klab mẽ
come gliding do Delhi poss. gliding club in
'Come on, let's do gliding in the gliding club of Delhi!'

22. ḍakṭar sahib āp us mīṭing mẽ prezant nahī̃ the. baḍā
Doctor Sahib you that meeting in present neg. were very
intresṭing ḍiskašan huā. spīkar ke poinṭ aph
interesting discussion occurred speaker poss. point of
viv se agrī nahī̃ kar sakā aur mãĩ ne phorsphul
view from agree neg. do was able and I ag. forceful
spīč ḍelivar kī. audiyans vaz mūvḍ kamplīṭlī
speech deliver did audience was moved completely
anḍ the havs vaz in my phevar. (Bhatia 1967:56)
and the house was in my favor

'Doctor Sahib [mode of address], were you not present at that meeting. There was a very interesting discussion. I did not agree with the point of view of the speaker, and I delivered a forceful speech. The audience was completely moved, and the house was in my favor.'

23. aiknāmiks ek aisā sabjakṭ hai jiskī ūṭilitī ḍe ṭu ḍe
economics one such subject is whose utility day-to-day
laif mẽ riyalāiz kī jā saktī hai
life in realize do go be able is [passive construction]

'Economics is such a subject that its utility can be realized in day-to-day life.'

In elucidation and interpretation, code-mixing provides two types of clues. First, in several South Asian languages, register stability is yet to be attained; therefore, English or Persian is used to elucidate a term or a concept. Secondly, English or Persian is used as a device

for reducing the possibility of ambiguity in a construction. Consider the following:

24. ... yah ṭhos kārban ḍāyaksāiḍ arthāt sūkhī baraph (D, 7.11.71)
this solid carbon dioxide meaning dry ice
'This (is) solid carbon dioxide, by which we mean dry ice'

25. jahā̃ glāiḍar ko sahārā rah jātā hai, kevaḷ tharmal
where glider to support remain Aux. only thermal
karanṭ kā arthāt garam havāõ kī tarangẽ (D, 17.6.73)
current poss. meaning hot winds poss. waves
'[at places where] the glider gets only the support of a thermal current, by which we mean waves of hot wind'

26. hamārī rājnīti āj bhī anek ghoṣṇāõ tathā samājvādī
our politics today also many slogans and socialist
āḍambarõ ke bād bhī mūltah viśiṣṭ vargīyā hai (D, 17.2.72)
pretences after also even mainly elitist is
'in spite of many slogans and socialist pretences [our politics] continues to be elitist'

27. ... maĩ bār bār tamāśā yā līlā ke rūp ko ... (D, 26.5.74)
I again again scene or miracle poss. form obj. marker

The items arthāt 'meaning' and ya 'or' introduce an elucidation, translation, or technical equivalent in another code.

5.0 CONSTRAINTS ON CODE-MIXING: A CLINE OF ACCEPTABILITY. There seems to be a cline of acceptability in code-mixing. Code-mixing is not an open-ended process either grammatically or lexically (especially in collocating lexical terms). The grammatical constraints, however, are

not necessarily of the type that yields 'yes' or 'no' judgments. The reaction toward the code-mixed construction is in the nature of 'sure', 'yes, depends', 'no', or a response of 'it is an odd mixing'. The following constraints are illustrative.

1. Rank-Shift Constraint: The rank-shifted constructions are not from English.

28. *vah kitāb which is on the table merī hai
that book . . . . . mine is

29. *merā vah amrīkī dost who lives in Chicago āj hamāre ghar ayegā
my that American friend . . . . . today our house will come

2. Conjunction Constraint: In code-mixing of South Asian language the English conjunctions nd, or, etc., are not used to conjoin non-English NP's or VP's.

30. *rām and šyām āye the
Ram and Shya came were

31. *maĩ usko akbār deta but diyā nahĩ
I him+obj. newspaper would give but gave neg.

Note, however, that conjoining two sentences from two languages is common. Consider

32. bhaĩ, khānā khāo and let us go.
brother (mode of address) food eat ...

33. John abhī āyā nahĩ but I must wait for him.
John right now came neg. but ...

Note that the conjoining items are from the same language from which the conjoined sentence is introduced. The following sentences, are, therefore, not the preferred constructions.

34. * bhaĩ, khana khao, aur let us go.
brother, food eat and ...

35. *John abhī āyā nahī̃ lekin I must wait for him.
John right now came neg. but ...

In the use of conjunction markers in code-mixing, a distinction must be made between those languages the items of which have been completely assimilated (e.g. Persian in Kashmiri) and those the items of which have yet to be assimilated (e.g. English in Kashmiri). The Persian conjunction markers are very frequent in Hindi and Kashmiri and native speakers of these languages are hardly aware of their sources.

4. *Determiner Constraint:* There are several constraints on the items which can be code-mixed in a noun phrase in pre-head positions.

36. *vahā̃ five sundar laṛkiyā̃ paṛh rahī thī̃ (numeral).
these.... beautiful girls reading were

37. *tum this sundar laṛkī kī bāt kar rahe the? (Demonstrative).
you .... beautiful girl of talking were

5. *Complementizer Constraint:* There are some constraints on code-mixing in complementizers. Consider the following:

(a) If the two sentences are from the same source languages, a complementizer from another source is not inserted.

38. *mujhe lagtā hai that rām kal āyegā.
to me seems aux .... Ram tomorrow will come

(b) Given two sentences from two sources (say, Hindi and English) the preference is given to a complementizer from the language used in the first sentence, e.g.,

39. mujhe lagtā hai ki rām will come tomorrow.
to me seems aux that Ram . . . . . .

This is especially true with verbs of perception, e.g. sunna 'to hear', socnā 'to think', or verbs of saying, e.g. kahnā 'to say', batānā 'to tell'.

6.0 LANGUAGE DYNAMICS AND LANGUAGE CHANGE. The last question I would like to consider here is that of the influence of code-mixing on South Asian languages. There is a long tradition of code-mixing among Persian, English, and the languages of the South Asian subcontinent. Code-mixing has initiated two major processes which have resulted in language change. The first process is that of Persianization and the second that of Englishization. As a result of these two processes, the South Asian languages have been influenced at all of the linguistic levels.

6.1 Phonology: There are several studies which discuss the assimilation of Persian and English loanwords in the phonological system of South Asian languages (for details, see Bahri 1960, Bhatia 1967, and B. Kachru 1975b).

6.2 Lexis: As already noted, there is mutual expectancy between the choice of the lexical range and the register or discourse types. The Sanskrit lexical spread is associated with the fields of literary criticism, philosophical writing, and with certain types of broadcasting. In certain languages (e.g. Telugu), the Sanskrit source items also mark a distinction between the formal and colloquial styles of language. The English source items have high frequency in the registers of the social sciences and technology.

6.3 Syntax: By and large, the syntax of a language is more resistant to change than are the other levels of language. So far, very little research has been done to investigate the impact of code-mixing

and code-switching on the syntax of South Asian languages. The following syntactic characteristics of Hindi are, however, attributed to the influence of English or Persian.

(a) SVO structure: The surface word order of Hindi is SOV, as opposed to the SVO order of English. In recent years in various styles of Hindi there has emerged a tendency to use an SVO structure (Mishra 1963:175-77; Tiwari 1966:296-300).

(b) Impersonal consturctions: Traditionally, in Hindi active forms are used where English uses what are termed 'impersonal consturctions', e.g. it is said, it has been learned. In Hindi the translation 'equivalents' of these English constructions are kahte haĩ, sunā hai. However, in the newspaper register of Hindi it is not uncommon to find constructions such as kahā jatā hai 'it is said', dekhā gayā hai 'it has been seen', or sunā gayā hai 'it has been heard'.

(c) Indirect speech: Traditionally, in Hindi discourse, the distinction between direct and indirect speech is not made. In modern prose this distinction has been introduced, e.g. NP said that he will read, as opposed to NP said that I will read.

(d) Post-head modifier jo: The development of the jo 'who' construction in Hindi in the post-head position is attributed to the influence of English by some scholars (e.g. Tiwari 1966:293), which other scholars believe that this construction may have developed due to the Persian influence (e.g. Guru 1962:530-31). Consider, for example,

40. vah laṛkā jo ṭebal par baiṭhā hai merā bhaī hai
that boy who table on sitting is my brother is
'The boy who is sitting on the table is my brother.'

(e) Passivization with dvārā: In Indo-Aryan languages there is

a tendency to delete the agent in passive constructions. This applies to Hindi. The agentive construction with dvārā 'by', which is now frequently used, is considered an influence of English. Consider, for example,

41. yah nāṭak bhārtendu dvārā likhā gayā hai
this play Bhartendu by written went is [passive construction]
'This play has been written by Bhartendu.'

(f) Parenthetical clauses: There are two views on the development of parenthetical clauses in Hindi. Some scholars claim that the introduction of these clauses is due to English influence. Others disagree and consider these as typically Indo-Aryan constructions. Such clauses are also present in Lalluji Lal's (1763-1835) prose. (See also Tiwari 1966:297-98; for the Persian influence on Hindi syntax, see ibid., 294-96.)

Similar effects of English and/or Persian influence may be traced in other South Asian languages, too. Consider, for example, the word order of Kashmiri. The preferred word order is SVO, which seems to be a result of the influence of Persian. This is especially true of the literary style (B. Kachru 1973).

7.0 'SWITCHING' WITHOUT 'MIXING': We still have to find methodological techniques to structure some aspects of code-mixing for which one does not necessarily find formal evidence. I have earlier used the term 'shift' for this process (B. Kachru 1965:402-3). The process of shifting does not result in the surface realization of code-mixing. But two languages which participate in the processes of code-mixing and code-switching also go through the process of shifting. This manifests itself in loan shifts and loan translations. In South Asia this process works in both directions. On the one hand, it is used to Indianize the English lan-

guage (B. Kachru 1965, 1966), and on the other hand, it is used to English-ize the South Asian languages (B. Kachru 1975b). Consider, for example loan translations such as the following: šīt yudh (SH, 13.6.71) and prem-trikon (ibid.), the translation equivalents of the English cold war and love-triangle, respectively. The process of shift from English is used in several registers of Hindi. In addition, a number of such formations are used in Hindi specifically in those contexts which are relevant to western culture, e.g. suprabhāt 'good morning', karmadan 'hand-shake', madhurāt 'honeymoon'.

8.0 CONCLUSION: It seems to me that the restricted date on code-mixing presented above show that in any descriptively adequate statement on code-mixing the interrelationships of role, form, and function are crucial. It has been argued that a statement which includes context as a congruent level for such a language contact situation as exists in code-mixing is not only relevant but also necessary for an insightful understanding, in functional terms, of such uses of language, which some scholars, in India and elsewhere, have termed 'odd-mixing' because such a 'mixing' is not supposes to occur in the 'pure' or 'standard' language (Raghuvira 1973).

In present sociolinguistic research it may be worth our while to investigate how the Firthian concepts of 'the context of situation' and of the 'renewal of connection' between form and function can be used to achieve a more insightful understanding of language contact situations and linguistic interaction. After all, it may be recalled that what is termed 'sociolinguistics' on this side of the Atlantic has always been part of 'general linguistics' on the other side of the ocean. That a process of rethinking has started is obvious in the following observation of Labov

(1970:152):

> In recent years, there has developed an approach to linguistic research which focuses upon language in use within the speech community, aiming at a linguistic theory adequate to account for this data. This type of research has sometimes been labelled as 'sociolinguistics', although it is somewhat misleading use of an oddly redundant term. Children raised in isolation do not use language; it is used by human beings in a social context, communicating their needs, ideas and emotions to one another. The egocentric monologues of children appear to be secondary developments derived from the social use of language (Vygotsky 1962:19) and very few people spend much time talking to themselves. It is questionable whether sentences that communicate nothing to anyone are a part of language. In what way, then, can 'sociolinguistics' be considered as something apart from 'linguistics'?

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

NOTES

[1]Terms such as 'unit', 'register', and 'rank shift' have been used here in the sense in which they are used in Halliday 1961.

[2]Note that in such codes one can also include specialized codes such as pidgins and creoles.

[3]For further discussion see relevant sections in Firth 1930 and 1937 and the following papers in Firth 1957: 'The technique of semantics', 'Modes of meaning', and 'General linguistics and descriptive grammar'. There is also discussion on it in Ellis 1965, Halliday 1959, B. Kachru 1966, Lyons 1966, and Mitchell 1957. 1a, and 1957b

[4]I have used the following abbreviations for the sources of illustrations given in this paper: D, Dharmayug, Bombay; NBT, Nav Bharat Times, New Delhi; S, Sarita, New Delhi; SH, Saptahik Hindustan, New Delhi.

REFERENCES

Bahri, Hardev. 1960. Persian influence on Hindi. Allahabad: Bharati Press Publications.

Bazell, C. E., et al., eds. 1966. In memory of J. R. Firth. London: Longmans.

Bhatia, Kailash Chandra. 1967. A linguistic study of English loanwords in Hindi (in Hindi). Allahabad: Hindustani Academy.

Dil, Afia. 1972. The Hindu and Muslim Dialects of Bengali. Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University.

Ellis, Jeffrey. 1965. 'On contextual meaning'. In C.E. Bazell, et. al. eds. 1966.

Emeneau, Murray B. 1966. 'India as a linguistic area', Language. 32:3-16.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. 'Diglossia'. In Dell Hymes, ed. 1964. 429-39.

Firth, John R. 1957a. Papers in Linguistics, 1934-51. London: Oxford University.

------. 1957b. 'A synopsis of linguistic theory, 1930-55'. In Palmer, F.R. ed. 1968.

------. 1951. 'Modes of meaning'. In Firth 1957a.

------. 1950. 'Personality and language in society'. In Firth, 1957.

------. 1935. 'The technique of semantics'. In Firth, 1957a.

Fishman, Joshua A. ed. 1971. Advances in the Sociology of Language, Vol. I. The Hague: Mouton.

Gumperz, John J. 1964. 'Hindi-Punjabi code-switching in Delhi'. In H.G. Lunt ed. 1964. 1115-24.

Gumperz, John J. and Wilson. 1971. 'Convergence and Creolization: a case from Indo-Aryan/Dravidian border'. In Dell Hymes ed. 1971. 151-67.

Guru, Kamtaprasad. 1962. Hindi Grammar (in Hindi). Benares: Nagari Pracharani Sabha.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1961. 'Categories of the theory of grammar', Word. 17:241-92.

------. 1959. 'The language of the Chinese secret History of the Mongols'. Philological Society Publication No. 17. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hymes, Dell ed. 1964. Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology. New York: Harper & Row, Inc.

------. ed. 1971. Pidginization and Creolization of Languages. London: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, Braj B. 1975a. 'Lexical innovations in South Asian English'. International Journal of the Sociology of Language. 4, 1975.

------. 1975b. 'The Englishization of Hindi: language rivalry and language change', to appear in I. Rauch et al. eds. Linguistic Method: Papers in Honor of Herbert Penzl. The Hague: Mouton.

------. 1973. An Introduction to Spoken Kashmiri (preliminary version). Urbana: Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois.

------. 1969. 'English in South Asia'. In Sebeok. 1969.

------. 1966. 'Indian English: a study in contextualization.' In Bazell et al. eds. 1966.

------. 1965. The Indianness in Indian English. Word. 21:391-410.

Kachru, Yamuna. 1968. An Introduction to Hindi Syntax. Urbana: Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois.

Labov, William. 1970. 'The study of language in its social context'. In Fishman, J.A. ed. 1971:152-216.

Langendoen, D. Terence. 1968. The London School of Linguistics: A Study of the Linguistic Theories of B. Malinowski and J.R. Firth. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press.

Lunt, H.G. ed. 1964. Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguistics. The Hague: Mouton.

Lyons, John. 1966.''Firth's theory of 'meaning''. In C.E. Bazell et al. eds. 1966.

Malinowski, B. 1935. Coral Gardens and Their Magic. A Study of the Methods of Tilling and Soil and of Agricultural Rites in the Trobriand Islands. Vol. 2. The Language of Magic and Gardening. London: Allen and Unwin.

------. 1923. The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In. C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards. 1923. 451-510.

Mishra, Vishwanath. 1963. The Influence of English on Hindi Language and Literature 1870-1920 (in Hindi). Dehradun: Sahitya Sadan.

Mitchell, T.F. 1957. 'The language of buying and selling in Cyrenaica: a situational statement', Hespéris, 44:31-71.

Ogden, C.K. and I.A. Richards. 1923. The Meaning of Meaning. London: Kegan Paul.

Palmer, F.R. ed. 1968. Selected Papers of J.R. Firth, 1952-1959. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Raghuvira. 1973. 'Why an Indian terminology?' In Bholanath Tiwari, et al. eds. Technical Terminology: Some Problems (in Hindi). Delhi: Sabdakar, 85-84.

Sebeok, Thomas. 1969. Current Trends in Linguistics. Vol. V. South Asia. The Hague: Mouton.

Sridhar, S. N. 1975. 'On the Aryanization of the Kannada lexicon: a study of the Hindi, Urdu loan words in Kannada'. in H. Van Olphen ed. 1975.

Shukla, R. ed. 1947. Hindi-Speakers, Beware! (in Hindi). Benaras: Kashi Nagari Pracarani Sabha.

Tiwari. 1966. The Hindi Language (in Hindi). Allahabad: Kitab Mahal.

Van Olphen, H. ed. 1975. Language Borrowing: Papers Presented at ACTUAL 1974. Austin: Center for Asian Studies, University of Texas.